

**SUPPLEMENTAL REMARKS**

As stated in the Amendment previously filed on January 13, 2006, upon entry of the Amendment, Claims 1 and 3-34 will be pending in the application.

In the Amendment Claim 1 was amended to incorporate the subject matter of Claim 2, now canceled. Claim 3 was amended based on the disclosure at page 6, line 18 in the application. Claim 4 was amended to depend on Claim 1 or Claim 3. Claims 33 and 34 were amended to depend on any one of Claims 1, 3, and 5-6.

Entry of the Amendment along with reconsideration and review of the claims on the merits was respectfully requested.

***Response to Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102 and §103***

In the Remarks section of the Amendment filed on January 13, 2006, please consider the following modified remarks. Inadvertent errors were made at paragraph D that are now corrected. Changes in the remarks are shown below to assist the Examiner. Canceled portions are crossed through and added portions are underlined as follows:

D. Claims 1-6, 33 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as assertedly being unpatentable over Shinohara et al (US 6,447,958) in view of Cieslak et al (US 5,002,843).

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 is amended to incorporate the subject matter of Claim 2, now canceled.

Applicants submit that Cieslak discloses a separator composed of an m-aramid fiber mat, but does not describe that a porous film of an m-aramid is useful as a separator. Therefore, a

technical concept that an m-aramid is ~~equivalent~~ preferred to a p-aramid as a material for a porous film ~~is not taught~~ cannot be derived, even if the teaching of Cieslak that a separator of a p-aramid fiber mat is equivalent to a separator of an m-aramid fiber mat is combined with the teaching of Shinohara in that a p-aramid is preferable as a material for a porous film.


Therefore, the invention of Claims 1, 3-6, 33 and 34 are clearly distinguished from the combination of Shinohara with Cieslak.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection over the combination of Shinohara with Cieslak.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



John K. Shin  
Registration No. 48,409

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: January 19, 2006